arXiv:1406.6605v2 [cs.LO] 21 Nov 2014

The satisfiability problem of SROIQ$^\sigma$ is decidable

Jon Haël Brenas[1] Rachid Echahed[1] Martin Strecker[2]

[1] CNRS and University of Grenoble
[2] Université de Toulouse / IRIT

Abstract. We consider a dynamic extension of the description logic $\mathcal{SROIQ}$. This means that interpretations could evolve thanks to some actions such as addition and/or deletion of an element (respectively, a pair of elements) of a concept (respectively, of a role). The obtained logic is called $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ with explicit substitutions and is written $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$. Substitution is not treated as meta-operation that is carried out immediately, but the operation of substitution may be delayed, so that sub-formulae of $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ are of the form $\Phi\sigma$, where Φ is a $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ formula and σ is a substitution which encodes changes of concepts and roles. In this paper, we particularly prove that the satisfiability problem of $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ is decidable.

1 Introduction

Description Logics [2] are logical formalisms for representing information about classes and objects. They are very often used as the basis of knowledge representation systems and have been used recently to develop OWL semantic web language, which can be viewed as an expressive Description Logic (DL).

There is an impressive variety of DLs. What they all have in common is that they are tailored to describe an established and fixed ontology and reason about its properties, even if they differ with respect to expressiveness and complexity of reasoning primitives.

Our goal here is to consider properties over dynamic ontologies. We introduce the notion of substitutions to express changes of ontologies (e.g. addition or deletion of an element, respectively a pair of elements, of a concept, respectively of a role). We investigate the addition of such substitutions in the particular case of the logic $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$, an extension of the logic $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ [5]. We mainly show that the problem of satisfiability in $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ is still decidable.

Our interest in the topic has arisen out of previous work on verification of transformations of graph structures [3,4]. These structures can be understood as models of DL formulae. We describe transformations by imperative programs with an appropriately adapted instruction set. The substitutions of $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ arise when computing weakest preconditions. More in general and apart from this particular application context, our results can be grafted on other formalisms, such as the variant of the DL $\mathcal{ALC}$ considered in [1].

The paper is structured as follows: Sect. 2 introduces $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$, our version of $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ with substitutions. Sect. 3 defines the interpretations for that logic. Sect. 4 proves that $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ is decidable by transforming formulae in $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ to formulae in $\mathcal{SROIQ}$. Sect. 5 illustrates such transformations. Finally, Sect. 6 concludes the paper.

2 Syntax

In this section, we define the syntax of the logics $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ and $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$. We start by introducing $\mathcal{SROIQ}$[5].

Usually, Description Logics are split into Aboxes (containing assertions like $\mathbf{C}(\mathsf{a})$, meaning that element a satisfies concept $\mathbf{C}$), Tboxes (containing concept inclusions like $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{D}$, meaning that each element satisfying $\mathbf{C}$ also satisfies $\mathbf{D}$) and Rboxes (containing role axioms). It is proved in [5] that Aboxes and Tboxes can be reduced. Thus we focus on $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ concepts and role axioms only.

Definition 1 (Signature, Concept name; Nominals; Role names; Individuals; Signature). *Let $\boldsymbol{C}$ be a set of **concept names** and $\boldsymbol{N}$ a set of **nominals** with $\boldsymbol{C}$ and $\boldsymbol{N}$ being disjoint, $\boldsymbol{R}$ a set of **role names** including the universal role U and $\boldsymbol{I}$ a set of **individuals**. The set of roles is $\boldsymbol{R} \cup \{R^- | R \in \boldsymbol{R}\}$, where a role R^- is called the **inverse role** of R. We define the signature Σ as $\Sigma = (\boldsymbol{C}, \boldsymbol{N}, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{I})$.*

We will use a running example, the description of a family, as a way to illustrate the diverse components of our logic.

Example 1. In this example, $\mathbf{C}$ will be $\{$**Animal**, **Female**, **Male** $\}$, $\mathbf{N}$ will be $\{\mathtt{Alice}, \mathtt{Bob}, \mathtt{Charles}\}$, $\mathbf{R}$ will be $\{U$, Offspring, Parent, Owner, Brother, Sister, FamilyMember$\}$ and $\mathbf{I}$ will be $\{\mathsf{Alice}\}$.

In $\mathcal{SROIQ}$, one can provide role axioms that state global properties of roles. They can take two different forms: role hierarchies and role assertions. For decidability reasons, we need the notions of regular hierarchy over roles as well as simple roles. We define these notions hereafter.

Definition 2 (Regular order). *A strict partial order $\prec$ on a set A is an irreflexive and transitive relation on A. A strict partial order $\prec$ on the set of roles is called a **regular order** if $\prec$ satisfies, additionally, $S \prec R \Leftrightarrow S^- \prec R$ for all roles R and S.*

Definition 3 (Role inclusion axiom). *A **role inclusion axiom** is an expression of the form $w \subseteq R$ where w is a finite string of roles not containing the universal role U and R is a role name, with $R \neq U$. A **role hierarchy** $\mathcal{R}_h$ is a finite set of role inclusion axioms. A role inclusion axiom $w \subseteq R$ is **$\prec$-regular** if R is a role name and w is defined by the following grammar:*
*$w = RR \mid R^- \mid S_1 \dots S_n \mid RS_1 \dots S_n \mid S_1 \dots S_n R$ with $S_i \prec R$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Finally, a role hierarchy $\mathcal{R}_h$ is **regular** if there exists a regular order $\prec$ such that each role inclusion axiom in $\mathcal{R}_h$ is $\prec$-regular.*

Example 2. For instance, BROTHER $\subseteq$ FAMILYMEMBER (that is the brother of a person is part of her family) and FATHER BROTHER $\subseteq$ FATHER (that is the father of a person's brother is her father) are role inclusion axioms that make sense.

The second possible kind of role axiom is the role assertion.

Definition 4 (Role assertion). *For roles R,S, we call the assertions $Ref(R)$, $Irr(R)$, $Sym(R)$, $Asy(R)$, $Tra(R)$ and $Dis(R, S)$* ***role assertions****. They, respectively, mean that R is reflexive, irreflexive, symmetric, asymmetric, transitive and that R and S are disjoint.*

Example 3. For instance, Tra(FAMILYMEMBER) and Irr(FATHER) are possible role assertions.

Definition 5 (Simple role; Simple assertion). *Given a role hierarchy $\mathcal{R}_h$ and a set of role assertions $\mathcal{R}_a$, a simple role is inductively defined as either a role name that does not occur in the right-hand side of any role inclusion axiom, or R^- for R simple, or the right-hand side of a role inclusion axiom $w \subseteq R$ where w is a simple role. $\mathcal{R}_a$ is called* ***simple*** *if all roles appearing in role assertions are simple.*

From now on, the only role hierarchies that we consider are regular and the only sets of role assertions that we consider are finite and simple.

The definition of the concept constructors is the difference between $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ and $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$. Below is the definition of the concepts of the logic $\mathcal{SROIQ}$.

Definition 6 ($\mathcal{SROIQ}$ concepts). *The set of concepts is defined as the smallest set containing:*

$C ::= \bot$ *(empty concept)*
| c *(concept name)*
| $\neg\, C$ *(negation)*
| $C \sqcap D$ *(conjunction)*
| $C \sqcup D$ *(disjunction)*
| $(\geq n\ S\ C)$ *(at least)*
| $(< n\ S\ C)$ *(no more than)*
| $\exists R.C$ *(exists)*
| $\forall R.C$ *(for all)*
| o *(nominal)*
| $\exists R.Self$ *(local reflexivity)*

where c is a concept name, R is a role, S is a simple role, o is a nominal and C, D are concepts.

Example 4. For example, the concept $\mathfrak{C} =$ (`Alice` $\sqcap$ ($\exists$ BROTHER.`Bob`) $\sqcap \forall$ SISTER$^-$.**Male**) $\sqcup$ (($<$ 3 PARENT $\top$)$\sqcap$($\geq$ 1 OWNER$^-$ **Animal**)$\sqcap\exists$FAMILYMEMBER.$Self$) is the concept satisfied by Alice (`Alice`) if she has a brother named Bob ($\exists$ BROTHER.`Bob`) and if all the persons whom she is a sister of are males ($\forall$ SISTER$^-$.**Male**) or by anyone having strictly less than 3 parents (($<$ 3 PARENT $\top$)), who is the owner of at least 1 animal (($\geq$ 1 OWNER$^-$ **Animal**)) and who is a member of her own family ($\exists$FAMILYMEMBER.$Self$).

In order to define the concepts of $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$, we need to introduce the notion of substitution. Substitutions, given in the definition below, are intended to modify concepts (respectively roles) by adding or removing individuals (respectively pairs of individuals).

Definition 7 (Substitution). *Given a role name R, a concept name C and individuals i and j, a substitution subst is:*
$subst ::= \epsilon$ *(empty substitution)*
$\quad\quad | \quad [RS]$ *(role substitution)*
$\quad\quad | \quad [CS]$ *(concept substitution)*
A role substitution can be either:
$RS ::= R := R - (i, j)$ *(deletion of relation instance)*
$\quad\quad | \quad R := R + (i, j)$ *(insertion of relation instance)*
while a concept substitution is either:
$CS ::= c := c - i$ *(deletion of a concept instance)*
$\quad\quad | \quad c := c + i$ *(insertion of a concept instance)*

Definition 8 ($\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ concepts). *The concepts of the logic $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ are those given in Def 6 in addition to the following explicit substitution constructor:*
$C ::=$ *($\mathcal{SROIQ}$ concept) (Def 6)*
$\quad\quad | \quad Csubst$ *(explicit substitution)*

Example 5. Roughly speaking, the $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ concept (∃SISTER.**Female**)[**Female** := **Female** + Alice] expresses the fact "there exists a sister who is female" *once the concept name Female has been dynamically modified to include Alice.*

3 Interpretations and models

Definition 9. *Let $\Sigma = (\boldsymbol{C}, \boldsymbol{N}, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{I})$ be a signature. As usual, an **interpretation** (over Σ) $\mathcal{I} = (\Delta^\mathcal{I}, .^\mathcal{I})$ consists of a set $\Delta^\mathcal{I}$, called the **domain** of $\mathcal{I}$, and a **valuation** $.^\mathcal{I}$ which associates to every concept name C a set $C^\mathcal{I}$ such that $C^\mathcal{I} \subseteq \Delta^\mathcal{I}$ and to each role name R a binary relation $R^\mathcal{I}$ such that $R^\mathcal{I} \subseteq \Delta^\mathcal{I} \times \Delta^\mathcal{I}$. The valuation of a nominal o is a singleton and the valuation of the universal role U is the universal relation $\Delta^\mathcal{I} \times \Delta^\mathcal{I}$. Finally, $\forall x \in \boldsymbol{I}$, $x^\mathcal{I} \in \Delta^\mathcal{I}$.*

As usual, $(R^-)^\mathcal{I} = \{(y, x) | (x, y) \in R^\mathcal{I}\}$ and for $w = Rw_1$, $w^\mathcal{I} = \{(x, y) | \exists z \in \Delta$ such that $(x, z) \in R^\mathcal{I}$ and $(z, y) \in w_1^\mathcal{I}\}$.

Definition 10. *An interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ **satisfies** a role inclusion axiom $w \subseteq R$, written $\mathcal{I} \models w \subseteq R'$, if $w^\mathcal{I} \subseteq R^\mathcal{I}$. An interpretation is a **model** of a role hierarchy $\mathcal{R}_h$ if it satisfies all role inclusion axioms in $\mathcal{R}_h$, written $\mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{R}_h$.*

As for role assertion axioms, for each interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ and all x, y, $z \in \Delta^\mathcal{I}$, we have:
$\mathcal{I} \models Asy(S)$ *iff* $(x, y) \in S^\mathcal{I} \Rightarrow (y, x) \notin S^\mathcal{I}$ *(role asymmetry)*
$\mathcal{I} \models Ref(S)$ *iff* $Diag^\mathcal{I} \subseteq S^\mathcal{I}$ *(role reflexivity)*
$\mathcal{I} \models Irr(S)$ *iff* $Diag^\mathcal{I} \cap S^\mathcal{I} = \emptyset$ *(role irefflexivity)*
$\mathcal{I} \models Dis(S_1, S_2)$ *iff* $S_1^\mathcal{I} \cap S_2^\mathcal{I} = \emptyset$ *(role disjunction)*
where $Diag^\mathcal{I} = \{(x, x) | x \in \Delta^\mathcal{I}\}$.

Definition 11. *For each interpretation $\mathcal{I}$, the valuations of $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ concepts are defined as:*

- $\bot^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$
- $(\neg\, C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \backslash C^{\mathcal{I}}$
- $(C \sqcap D)^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}} \cap D^{\mathcal{I}}$
- $(C \sqcup D)^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}} \cup D^{\mathcal{I}}$
- $(\geq n\ S\ C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \geq n\}$
- $(< n\ S\ C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} < n\}$
- $(\exists R.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
- $(\forall R.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
- $(\exists R.Self)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid (x,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}\}$

The valuation for concept name and nominal are not repeated as they have been previously defined in Def 9.

Example 6. The valuation of $\mathfrak{C}$ is then $\{x \mid (\mathtt{Alice}^{\mathcal{I}} = x \wedge \exists y.((x,y) \in \textsc{Brother}^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge \mathtt{Bob}^{\mathcal{I}} = y) \wedge \forall z.((z,x) \in \textsc{Sister}^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow z \in \mathbf{Male}^{\mathcal{I}})) \vee (card\{a \mid (x,a) \in \textsc{Parent}^{\mathcal{I}}\} < 3 \wedge card\{b \mid (b,x) \in \textsc{Owner}^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge b \in \mathbf{Animal}^{\mathcal{I}}\} \geq 1 \wedge (x,x) \in \textsc{FamilyMember}^{\mathcal{I}})\}$.



Fig. 1. Example of a model of $\mathfrak{C}$. Pink rectangle nodes are **Female**, round blue nodes are **Male** and green elliptic nodes are **Animal**.

Definition 12. *Let c be a concept name, i and j be individuals, C be a concept and r be a role name, the interpretations of concepts with substitutions are:*

- $(C\epsilon)^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}}$
- $(C[c := c + i])^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}}$ *where* $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ *is replaced by* $c^{\mathcal{I}} \cup i^{\mathcal{I}}$
- $(C[c := c - i])^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}}$ *where* $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ *is replaced by* $c^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{i^{\mathcal{I}}}$
- $(C[r := r + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}}$ *where* $r^{\mathcal{I}}$ *is replaced by* $r^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(i^{\mathcal{I}}, j^{\mathcal{I}})\}$
- $(C[r := r - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}}$ *where* $r^{\mathcal{I}}$ *is replaced by* $r^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{\{(i^{\mathcal{I}}, j^{\mathcal{I}})\}}$

Example 7. The valuation of $(\exists \textsc{Sister}.\mathbf{Female})[\mathbf{Female} := \mathbf{Female} + \mathsf{Alice}]$ is then $\{x \mid \exists y.((x,y) \in \textsc{Sister}^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in (\mathbf{Female}^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \mathsf{Alice}^{\mathcal{I}})\}$.

4 Decidability of the satisfiability problem in $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$

It is known that the satisfiability problem of $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ is decidable [5]. We show below that this nice property still holds when considering explicit substitutions.

Theorem 1. *Let Φ_0 be a $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ concept, $\mathcal{R}_h$ be a regular role hierarchy and $\mathcal{R}_a$ be a finite set of role assertions. The satisfiability of Φ_0 w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}_h$ and $\mathcal{R}_a$ is decidable.*

The proof of Theorem 1 is done by translating concepts with substitutions into concepts without substitutions.

The idea is to associate to each possible pair of a concept and a substitution an equivalent concept not containing any substitution. In the following, these pairs are grouped by concept constructor as two different substitutions affecting the same concept constructor are often treated the same. From now on, let c and c' be different concept names, C and D be concepts, R and R' be role names such that $R \neq R'$, S be a simple role name such that $S \neq R'$, o be a nominal, θ be a substitution, o_i be a nominal associated to individual i such that $o_i^{\mathcal{I}} = i^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $\bowtie$ be either $<$ or $\geq$. For ease of reading, we define $C \Rightarrow D$ as $\neg C \sqcup D$.

The translation of concepts with substitutions into concepts without substitutions is defined by means of a system of 41 rules, that we name $\mathcal{T}$, displayed below.

1 $\bot\ \theta \rightsquigarrow \bot$
2 $o\ \theta \rightsquigarrow o$

Since substitutions do not affect the valuations of $\bot$ and the nominals, viz. o, the valuations are the same with or without substitutions.

3 $c[R := R \pm (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow c$
4 $c[c' := c' \pm i] \rightsquigarrow c$
5 $c[c := c + i] \rightsquigarrow c \sqcup o_i$
6 $c[c := c - i] \rightsquigarrow c \sqcap \neg o_i$

The substitutions $[R := R \pm (i,j)]$ and $[c' := c' \pm i]$ do not affect the valuation of concept name c thus the valuation is the same with or without them. On the other hand, if one adds element i to (resp. removes it from) the valuation of concept name c, viz. rule 5 (resp rule 6), then an element will be in the valuation of c iff it was before or if it is i itself (resp. it was before and it is not i).

7 $(\neg C)\ \theta \rightsquigarrow \neg(C\ \theta)$
8 $(C \sqcup D)\ \theta \rightsquigarrow C\ \theta \sqcup D\ \theta$
9 $(C \sqcap D)\ \theta \rightsquigarrow C\ \theta \sqcap D\ \theta$

Substitutions are propagated along boolean operators in an obvious way.

10 $\exists R.Self[c := c \pm i] \rightsquigarrow \exists R.Self$
11 $\exists R^-.Self[c := c \pm i] \rightsquigarrow \exists R^-.Self$
12 $\exists R.Self[R' := R' \pm (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow \exists R.Self$

13 $\exists R^-.Self[R' := R' \pm (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow \exists R^-.Self$

Substitutions $[c := c \pm i]$ and $[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]$ do not affect the role name R, hence the rules 10 – 14.

14 $\exists R.Self[R := R + (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow (o_i \sqcap o_j) \sqcup \exists R.Self$
15 $\exists R.Self[R := R - (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow (\neg o_i \sqcup \neg o_j) \sqcap \exists R.Self$
16 $\exists R^-.Self[R := R - (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow (\neg o_i \sqcup \neg o_j) \sqcap \exists R^-.Self$
17 $\exists R^-.Self[R := R + (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow (o_i \sqcap o_j) \sqcup \exists R^-.Self$

$\exists R.Self$ is satisfied by an element, say k, when adding (i,j) to (resp. removing from) R iff it was already satisfied or $k = i = j$ (resp. it was already satisfied and either $k \neq i$ or $k \neq j$). The direction of the self-loop being irrelevant, the translations are the same for $\exists R^-.Self$.

18 $(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[c := c \pm i] \rightsquigarrow (\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[c := c \pm i])$
19 $(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[c := c \pm i] \rightsquigarrow (\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C[c := c \pm i])$
20 $(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow (\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])$
21 $(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow (\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])$

Substitutions $[c := c \pm i]$ and $[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]$ do not modify the valuation of S, hence the rules 18 – 21.

22 $(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[S := S + (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow$
$((o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcap \forall S.\neg o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(\bowtie\ (n-1)\ S\ C[S := S + (i,j)]))$
$\sqcap\ ((\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg C[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists S.o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[S := S + (i,j)]))$

23 $(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[S := S + (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow$
$((o_j \sqcap \exists U.(o_i \sqcap C[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcap \forall S^-.\neg o_i) \Rightarrow$
$(\bowtie\ (n-1)\ S^-\ C[S := S + (i,j)]))$
$\sqcap\ ((\neg o_j \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_i \sqcup \neg C[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists S^-.o_i) \Rightarrow$
$(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C[S := S + (i,j)]))$

24 $(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[S := S - (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow$
$((o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[S := S - (i,j)]) \sqcap \exists S.o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(\bowtie\ (n+1)\ S\ C[S := S - (i,j)]))$
$\sqcap\ ((\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg C[S := S - (i,j)]) \sqcup \forall S.\neg o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[S := S - (i,j)]))$

25 $(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[S := S - (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow$
$((o_j \sqcap \exists U.(o_i \sqcap C[S := S - (i,j)]) \sqcap \exists S^-.o_i) \Rightarrow$
$(\bowtie\ (n+1)\ S^-\ C[S := S - (i,j)]))$
$\sqcap\ ((\neg o_j \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_i \sqcup \neg C[S := S - (i,j)]) \sqcup \forall S^-.\neg o_i) \Rightarrow$
$(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C[S := S - (i,j)]))$

The concepts in the left-hand sides of the rules above are satisfied by an element, say k, if three conditions are met (see Fig. 2). First, k must be such that $k = i$ (resp. $k = j$ if the concept uses S^-). Second, the addition (resp. removal) should change something, that is the edge (i, j) should not already exist (resp. should already exist). Third, the valuation of the concept is modified if j (resp. i if the concept uses S^-) satisfies C after the substitution. If one of these conditions is not met, one just needs to count the neighbors satisfying C after the substitution. If all are met, there is exactly one more (resp. one less) element after the substitution.

26 $(\exists R.C)[c := c \pm i] \rightsquigarrow \exists R.(C[c := c \pm i])$
27 $(\exists R^-.C)[c := c \pm i] \rightsquigarrow \exists R.(C[c := c \pm i])$
28 $(\exists R.C)[R' := R' \pm (i, j)] \rightsquigarrow \exists R.(C[R' := R' \pm (i, j)])$
29 $(\exists R^-.C)[R' := R' \pm (i, j)] \rightsquigarrow \exists R.(C[R' := R' \pm (i, j)])$

Substitutions $[c := c \pm i]$ and $[R' := R' \pm (i, j)]$ do not modify the valuation of R, hence the rules 26 – 29.

30 $(\exists R.C)[R := R + (i, j)] \rightsquigarrow$
$(o_i \Rightarrow \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i, j)]) \sqcup \exists R.C[R := R + (i, j)]) \sqcap$
$(\neg o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R + (i, j)]))$
31 $(\exists R^-.C)[R := R + (i, j)] \rightsquigarrow$
$(o_j \Rightarrow \exists U.(o_i \sqcap C[R := R + (i, j)]) \sqcup \exists R^-.C[R := R + (i, j)]) \sqcap$
$(\neg o_j \Rightarrow \exists R^-.(C[R := R + (i, j)]))$
32 $(\exists R.C)[R := R - (i, j)] \rightsquigarrow (o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R - (i, j)] \sqcap \neg o_j))$
$\sqcap \ (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R - (i, j)]))$
33 $(\exists R^-.C)[R := R - (i, j)] \rightsquigarrow (o_j \Rightarrow \exists R^-.(C[R := R - (i, j)] \sqcap \neg o_i))$
$\sqcap \ (\neg o_j \Rightarrow \exists R^-.(C[R := R - (i, j)]))$

In these cases, if the considered element, say k is not i (resp. not j when R^- is used), one only forwards the substitution as the new edge ((i, j)) (resp. the suppressed edge) is not used. If $k = i$ (resp. $k = j$), then either the new edge (i, j) is used and then j (resp. i) must satisfy C after the substitution or it is not used and then the substitution is forwarded. If one deletes the edge (i, j), then one has to check that j (resp. i) was not the only element satisfying C after the substitution, that is to say, there is an element different from j (resp. i) that satisfies C after the substitution.

34 $(\forall R.C)[c := c \pm i] \rightsquigarrow \forall R.(C[c := c \pm i])$
35 $(\forall R^-.C)[c := c \pm i] \rightsquigarrow \forall R^-.(C[c := c \pm i])$
36 $(\forall R.C)[R' := R' \pm (i, j)] \rightsquigarrow \forall R.(C[R' := R' \pm (i, j)])$
37 $(\forall R^-.C)[R' := R' \pm (i, j)] \rightsquigarrow \forall R^-.(C[R' := R' \pm (i, j)])$

Substitutions $[c := c \pm i]$ and $[R' := R' \pm (i, j)]$ do not modify the valuation of R, hence the rules 34 – 37.

38 $(\forall R.C)[R := R + (i, j)] \rightsquigarrow$
$(o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R + (i, j)]) \sqcap \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i, j)])) \sqcap$
$(\neg o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R + (i, j)]))$

39 $(\forall R^-.C)[R := R + (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow$
$(o_j \Rightarrow \forall R^-.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcap \exists U.(o_i \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)])) \sqcap$
$(\neg o_j \Rightarrow \forall R^-.(C[R := R + (i,j)]))$

40 $(\forall R.C)[R := R - (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow (o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R - (i,j)] \sqcup o_j))$
$\sqcap \ (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R - (i,j)]))$

41 $(\forall R^-.C)[R := R - (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow (o_j \Rightarrow \forall R^-.(C[R := R - (i,j)] \sqcup o_i))$
$\sqcap \ (\neg o_j \Rightarrow \forall R^-.(C[R := R - (i,j)]))$

See Fig. 3 for the illustration. If an element, say k, satisfies the left-hand side concepts of the rules above then either $k \neq i$ (resp. $k \neq j$ when R^- is used), which means that the substitution does not affect any used edge, and thus all elements reachable from k through an R-edge (resp. R^--edge) satisfy C after the substitution. On the other hand, if $k = i$ (resp. $k = j$) then, when adding the new edge (i,j), j (resp. i) and all other elements reachable from k through an R-edge (resp. R^--edge) satisfy C after the substitution. Otherwise, that is when removing the edge (i,j), the only element reachable from k through an R-edge (resp. an R^--edge) possibly not satisfying C after the substitution is j (resp. i).



Fig. 2. Example illustrating rule 24. The nodes satisfying $C[R := R + (i,j)]$ are drawn in red, the current node is circled in black. The top left graph shows the case in which the first part of the first implication is true, that is $(\geq 2R.C)[R := R - (i,j)]$ is true if $(\geq 3R.C[R := R - (i,j)])$ is. The top right graph (resp. bottom left, bottom right)shows that if o_i is false (resp. j doesn't satisfy $C[R := R - (i,j)]$, (i,j) is not an R-edge), then the modification does not affect the property.

Now we show that, for each translation rule $L \rightsquigarrow R$, the valuations of L and R are the same under a given interpretation.

Lemma 1. *Let Σ be a signature, $\mathcal{I}$ be an interpretation over Σ, $L \rightsquigarrow R$ be one of the above translation rules (1 – 41), then $L^{\mathcal{I}} = R^{\mathcal{I}}$.*

*Proof.*The complete proof of the lemma is given in the appendix. □



Fig. 3. Example illustrating rule 38. The nodes satisfying $C[R := R + (i, j)]$ are drawn in red, the current node is circled in black. The leftmost graph shows the case in which o_i is true, and then $(\forall R.C)[R := R + (i, j)]$ will be true if j satisfies $C[R := R + (i, j)]$. The rightmost graph shows that if o_i is false, then the modification does not affect the property.

Now we show that, given a $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ concept, applying the translation rules yields a $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ concept.

Lemma 2. *Let Σ be a signature, $\mathcal{T}$ is terminating.*

Proof. The proof is in the appendix. □

Lemma 3. *Let Σ be a signature, ϕ be a $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ concept, ψ be a normal form obtained from ϕ by rewriting the concept ϕ using the rewrite rules of $\mathcal{T}$, then ψ is a $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ concept.*

Proof. The final result is substitution-free as, if there was a substitution remaining it would have the form of the left-hand side of one of the rules hence it wouldn't be a normal form. □

With these three lemmata, it is easy to prove the theorem.

Proof. The translations allow us to obtain $\mathcal{SROIQ}$-concepts from $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$-concepts. As the satisfiability of an $\mathcal{SROIQ}$-concept is known to be decidable, so is the satisfiability of an $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$-concept. □

5 Example

In this section, we illustrate with a simple example the translation rules given in the previous section. Consider the graph on the left of Fig. 4, one can see that element i satisfies the concept $(<\ 3\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top))$. We show hereafter that $(<\ 3\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top))$ still holds at element i after adding the S-edge (i, j), that is we want to see that:

o_i	At element i,
$\sqcap\ (<\ 3\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top))[S := S + (i, j)]$	$(<\ 3\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top))$ is satisfied after substitution $[S := S + (i, j)]$
$\sqcap\ (<\ 3\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top))$	$(<\ 3\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top)))$ is satisfied
$\sqcap\ \exists S.o_i$	there is an edge (i, i)
$\sqcap\ \exists S.o_k$	there is an edge (i, k)
$\sqcap\ \forall S.\neg o_j$	there is *not* an edge (i, j)
$\sqcap\ \exists U.(o_j \sqcap (<\ 1\ S\ \top) \sqcap \neg o_i)$	j has no S-outgoing edge and $j \neq i$
$\sqcap\ \exists U.(o_k \sqcap (<\ 1\ S\ \top) \sqcap \neg o_i)$	k has no S-outgoing edge and $k \neq i$

is satisfiable.



Fig. 4. Example of graph transformation

By applying rule 22 to $(<\ 3\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top))[S := S + (i,j)]$, one obtains
$((o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j\ \sqcap (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcap \forall S.\neg o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(<\ 2\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]))$
$\sqcap ((\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg(<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists S.o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(<\ 3\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)])).$
Let's deal with $(<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]$. By applying rule 22 again, one gets
$(o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j\ \sqcap \top[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcap \forall S.\neg o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(<\ 2\ S\ \top[S := S + (i,j)])) \sqcap ((\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg\top[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists S.o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(<\ 3\ S\ \top[S := S + (i,j)])$. When applying rules 1 and 7, it is obvious that $\top[S := S + (i,j)])$ is $\top$.
Then, in $\exists U.(o_j\ \sqcap (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)])$, knowing that $\exists U.(o_j \sqcap \neg o_i)$, $\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg\top[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists S.o_j$ is satisfied and thus $\exists U.(o_j\ \sqcap (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)])$ becomes $\exists U.(o_j\ \sqcap (<\ 3\ S\ \top))$ which, as $\exists U.(o_j \sqcap (<\ 1\ S\ \top))$ is satisfied, is true. As $\forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg(<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)])$ is exactly $\neg(\exists U.(o_j\ \sqcap (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]))$, $\forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg(<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)])$ is false.
Thus, going back to $((o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j\ \sqcap (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcap \forall S.\neg o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(<\ 2\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]))$
$\sqcap ((\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg(<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists S.o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(<\ 3\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]))$, what one gets is $((o_i \sqcap \top \sqcap \forall S.\neg o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(<\ 2\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)])) \sqcap ((\neg o_i \sqcup \bot \sqcup \exists S.o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(<\ 3\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]))$.
As we are at i and, from $\forall S.\neg o_j$, there is no S-edge (i,j), what we have to prove is $(<\ 2\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]$, that is that i has less than 2 S-neighbors such that they have less than 3 S-neighbors after the substitution. We will test all of these neighbors. From $(<\ 3\ S\ \top)$, we know that there are at most 2 neighbors and, from $\exists S.o_i$ and $\exists S.o_k$, we know that these neighbors are i and k. We have to prove that one of them doesn't satisfy $(<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]$.
Let's prove that i doesn't satisfy $(<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]$. As $o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j\ \sqcap \top[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcap \forall S.\neg o_j$ is satisfied at i (we know that i satisfies o_i, that there is an element j (thus $\exists U.(o_j\ \sqcap \top)$ is true) and that there is no S-edge (i,j)), $(<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]$ is satisfied at i iff $(<\ 2\ S\ \top[S := S + (i,j)])$ is satisfied at i. But, as $\top[S := S + (i,j)] \rightsquigarrow \top$, $(<\ 2\ S\ \top[S := S + (i,j)])$ is not satisfied at i (as i has 2 different neighbors). Thus, $(<\ 2\ S\ (<\ 3\ S\ \top)[S := S + (i,j)]$ is satisfied at i which means that the initial concept is satisfiable.

6 Conclusion

We have introduced a new Description Logic named $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ which is an extension of $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ with substitutions. We have proven that this logic is decidable by translating it to $\mathcal{SROIQ}$.

The same method can likely be used for several other DLs. For instance, $\mathcal{SHOIQ}$ [6] is a restriction of $\mathcal{SROIQ}$ without role assertions and $\exists R.Self$. As none of the translation rules outside these constructs uses these constructs, they can be removed and $\mathcal{SHOIQ}^\sigma$ can be defined in the exact same way as $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$.

On the other hand, Description Logics like $\mathcal{ALC}$ [7] that is restricted to concepts without counting quantifiers are not suited for such a translation. Existential and universal quantification would create couting quantifiers during translation that are outside the scope of the logic. Even extending $\mathcal{ALC}$ with counting quantifiers, which produces $\mathcal{ALCQ}$, is not enough as nominals are used during translation.

References

1. Shqiponja Ahmetaj, Diego Calvanese, Magdalena Ortiz and Mantas Simkus *Managing Change in Graph-structured Data Using Description Logics*. Proc. of the 28th AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2014), pages 966-973.
2. Franz Baader, Diego Calvanese, Deborah L. McGuinness, Daniele Nardi, and Peter F. Patel-Schneider, editors. *The Description Logic Handbook: Theory, Implementation, and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2003.
3. Jon Haël Brenas, Rachid Echahed and Martin Strecker *A Hoare-Like Calculus Using the $\mathcal{SROIQ}^\sigma$ Logic on Transformations of Graphs* Theoretical Computer Science 2014, volume 8705, pages 164-178.
4. Mohamed Chaabani, Rachid Echahed and Martin Strecker *Logical Foundations for Reasoning about Transformations of Knowledge Bases*. DL Description Logics 2013, volume 1014, pages 616-627.
5. I. Horrocks, O. Kutz, and U. Sattler. The even more irresistible sroiq. In *Proc. of the 10th Int. Conf. on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR 2006)*, pages 57–67.
6. Ian Horrocks and Ulrike Sattler. A tableaux decision procedure for shoiq. In *In Proc. of the 19th Int. Joint Conf. on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI*, pages 448–453. Morgan, 2005.
7. Manfred Schmidt-Schaubß and Gert Smolka. Attributive concept descriptions with complements. *Artif. Intell.*, 48(1):1–26, February 1991.

Appendix

First we prove Lemma 1.

> Let Σ be a signature, $\mathcal{I}$ be an interpretation over Σ, $L \rightsquigarrow R$ be one of the above translation rules (1 – 41), then $L^{\mathcal{I}} = R^{\mathcal{I}}$.

Proof.

1. $(\bot\ \theta)^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset = \bot^{\mathcal{I}}$ as it does not depend on the valuation of any concept or role.
2. As the valuation of a nominal is independent of the valuations of all roles and concepts, $(o\ \theta)^{\mathcal{I}} = o^{\mathcal{I}}$.
3. $(c[R := R \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = c^{\mathcal{I}}$ as $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ does not depend on the valuation of R.
4. $(c[c' := c' \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = c^{\mathcal{I}}$ as $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ does not depend on the valuation of c'.
5. $(c[c := c + i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (c \sqcup o_i)^{\mathcal{I}}$. By definition of the valuation of a substitution, $(c[c := c + i])^{\mathcal{I}} = c^{\mathcal{I}} \cup i = (c \sqcup o_i)^{\mathcal{I}}$.
6. $(c[c := c - i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (c \sqcap \neg o_i)^{\mathcal{I}}$. By definition of the valuation of a substitution, $(c[c := c - i])^{\mathcal{I}} = c^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{i} = (c \sqcap \neg o_i)^{\mathcal{I}}$.
7. By definition, $((\neg C)[c := c + i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\neg C)^{\mathcal{I}}$ where $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ is replaced by $c^{\mathcal{I}} \cup i$. As $(\neg C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \Delta \cap \overline{C^{\mathcal{I}}}$, $((\neg C)[c := c + i])^{\mathcal{I}} = \Delta \cap \overline{C'^{\mathcal{I}}}$ with $C'^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}}$ where $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ is replaced by $c^{\mathcal{I}} \cup i$. This is exactly the definition of $(\neg(C[c := c + i]))^{\mathcal{I}}$. The same can be done with the other substitutions.
8. By definition, $((C \sqcup D)[c := c + i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (C \sqcup D)^{\mathcal{I}}$ where $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ is replaced by $c^{\mathcal{I}} \cup i$. That is $(C' \sqcup D')^{\mathcal{I}}$ with $C'^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}}$ where $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ is replaced by $c^{\mathcal{I}} \cup i$ and $D'^{\mathcal{I}} = D^{\mathcal{I}}$ where $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ is replaced by $c^{\mathcal{I}} \cup i$. This is exactly the definition of $(C[c := c + i] \sqcup D[c := c + i])^{\mathcal{I}}$. The same can be done with the other substitutions.
9. By definition, $((C \sqcap D)[c := c + i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (C \sqcap D)^{\mathcal{I}}$ where $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ is replaced by $c^{\mathcal{I}} \cup i$. That is $(C' \sqcap D')^{\mathcal{I}}$ with $C'^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}}$ where $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ is replaced by $c^{\mathcal{I}} \cup i$ and $D'^{\mathcal{I}} = D^{\mathcal{I}}$ where $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ is replaced by $c^{\mathcal{I}} \cup i$. This is exactly the definition of $(C[c := c + i] \sqcap D[c := c + i])^{\mathcal{I}}$. The same can be done with the other substitutions.
10. $(\exists R.Self[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\exists R.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$ as $(\exists R.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of c.
11. $(\exists R^-.Self[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\exists R^-.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$ as $(\exists R^-.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of c.
12. $(\exists R.Self[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\exists R.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$ as $(\exists R.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of R'.
13. $(\exists R^-.Self[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\exists R^-.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$ as $(\exists R^-.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of R'.
14. As $(\exists R.Self)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x | (x,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, $(\exists R.Self[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x | (x,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(i,j)\}\} = (\exists R.Self)^{\mathcal{I}} \cup (\{i\} \cap \{j\})$ that is $(\exists R.Self[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = ((o_i \sqcap o_j) \sqcup \exists R.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$.

15. As $(\exists R^-.Self)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x|(x,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, $(\exists R^-.Self[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x|(x,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(i,j)\}\} = (\exists R^-.Self)^{\mathcal{I}} \cup (\{i\} \cap \{j\})$ that is $(\exists R^-.Self[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = ((o_i \sqcap o_j) \sqcup \exists R^-.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$.
16. As $(\exists R.Self)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x|(x,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, $(\exists R.Self[R := R - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x|(x,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{\{(i,j)\}}\} = (\exists R.Self)^{\mathcal{I}} \cap (\overline{\{i\}} \cup \overline{\{j\}})$ that is $(\exists R.Self[R := R - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = ((\neg o_i \sqcup \neg o_j) \sqcap \exists R.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$.
17. As $(\exists R^-.Self)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x|(x,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, $(\exists R^-.Self[R := R - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x|(x,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{\{(i,j)\}}\} = (\exists R^-.Self)^{\mathcal{I}} \cap (\overline{\{i\}} \cup \overline{\{j\}})$ that is $(\exists R^-.Self[R := R - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = ((\neg o_i \sqcup \neg o_j) \sqcap \exists R^-.Self)^{\mathcal{I}}$.
18. As $(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$, $((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[c := c \pm i]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$ as $S^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of c. Thus $((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}}$.
19. As $(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (y,x) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$, $((\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (y,x) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[c := c \pm i]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$ as $S^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of c. Thus $((\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}}$.
20. As $(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$, $((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$ as $S^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of R'. Thus $((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}}$.
21. As $(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (y,x) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$, $((\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (y,x) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$ as $S^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of R'. Thus $((\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}}$.
22. As $(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$, $((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[S := S + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(i,j)\} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$. We consider $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(i,j)\} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ and try the possible sets:
    - If $x \neq i$ or $j \notin C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}$ or $(i,j) \in S^{\mathcal{I}}$, then $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(i,j)\} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} = \{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$,
    - else, $x = i$ and $j \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $(i,j) \notin S^{\mathcal{I}}$, and thus $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(i,j)\} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} = \{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \cup \{(i,j)\}$. As $\{(i,j)\}$ is disjoint from $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, the cardinality of $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(i,j)\} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ is exactly the cardinality of $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} + 1$.
    - Thus, $\{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\} = \{x \mid (x \neq i \vee j \notin C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \vee (i,j) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow$

$card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n)$
$\wedge (x = i \wedge j \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge (i,j) \notin S^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow$
$card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie (n-1))\}$

Thus, $((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[S := S + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} =$
$(((o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j\ \sqcap C[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcap \forall S.\neg o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(\bowtie\ (n-1)\ S\ C[S := S + (i,j)]))$
$\sqcap ((\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg C[S := S + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists S.o_j) \Rightarrow$
$(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[S := S + (i,j)]))))^{\mathcal{I}}$

23. One can see that $(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[S := S + (i,j)]$ is similar to $(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[S^- := S^- + (j,i)]$, that is replacing S by S^- and swapping i and j in the previous case.
24. As $(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$,
$((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[S := S - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} =$
$\{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\} =$
$\{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{\{(i,j)\}} \wedge y \in C[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$. We consider $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{\{(i,j)\}} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ and try the possible sets:
    - If $x \neq i$ or $j \notin C[\underline{S := S - (i,j)}]^{\mathcal{I}}$ or $(i,j) \notin S^{\mathcal{I}}$, then
    $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{\{(i,j)\}} \wedge y \in C[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} =$
    $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$,
    - else, $x = i$ and $\underline{j \in C}[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $(i,j) \in S^{\mathcal{I}}$, and thus
    $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{\{(i,j)\}} \wedge y \in C[S := S - \underline{(i,j)}]^{\mathcal{I}}\} =$
    $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \cap \overline{\{i,j\}}$. As $\{(i,j)\} \subseteq$
    $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in \underline{C[S} := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, the cardinality of
    $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{\{(i,j)\}} \wedge y \in C[S := S + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ is exactly the cardinality of $\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} - 1$.
    - Thus,
    $\{x \mid card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n\}$
    $= \{x \mid$
    $(x \neq i \vee j \notin C[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \vee (i,j) \notin S^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow$
    $card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie n)$
    $\wedge (x = i \wedge j \in C[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge (i,j) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow$
    $card\{y \mid (x,y) \in S^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[S := S - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} \bowtie (n+1))\}$

    Thus, $((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[S := S - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} =$
    $(((o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j\ \sqcap C[S := S - (i,j)]) \sqcap \exists S.o_j) \Rightarrow$
    $(\bowtie\ (n+1)\ S\ C[S := S - (i,j)]))$
    $\sqcap ((\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg C[S := S - (i,j)]) \sqcup \forall S.\neg o_j) \Rightarrow$
    $(\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[S := S - (i,j)])))^{\mathcal{I}}$
25. One can see that $(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[S := S - (i,j)]$ is similar to $(\bowtie\ n\ S^-\ C)[S^- := S^- - (j,i)]$, that is replacing S by S^- and swapping i and j in the previous case.
26. As $(\exists R.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$,
$((\exists R.C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[c := c \pm i]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ as $R^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of c. Thus
$((\exists R.C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\exists R.(C[c := c \pm i]))^{\mathcal{I}}$.

27. As $(\exists R^-.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(y,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$,
$((\exists R^-.C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(y,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[c := c \pm i]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ as $R^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of c. Thus
$((\exists R^-.C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\exists R^-.(C[c := c \pm i]))^{\mathcal{I}}$.

28. As $(\exists R.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$,
$((\exists R.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge$
$y \in C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ as $R^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of R'. Thus
$((\exists R.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\exists R.(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]))^{\mathcal{I}}$

29. As $(\exists R^-.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(y,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$,
$((\exists R^-.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(y,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge$
$y \in C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ as $R^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of R'. Thus
$((\exists R^-.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\exists R^-.(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]))^{\mathcal{I}}$

30. As $(\exists R.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$,
$((\exists R.C)[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(x,y) \in R[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge$
$y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ that is $((\exists R.C)[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} =$
$\{x \mid \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(i,j)\} \wedge y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} =$
$\{x \mid (\exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}) \vee (x = i \wedge$
$j \in C[R := R + (i,j)])\} = \{x \mid (x = i \Rightarrow \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge$
$y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \vee j \in C[R := R + (i,j)]) \wedge (x \neq i \Rightarrow \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge$
$y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}})\}$. Moreover, $((o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcup$
$\exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)])) \sqcap (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R + (i,j)])))^{\mathcal{I}} =$
$\{x \mid (x = i \Rightarrow \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \vee$
$j \in C[R := R + (i,j)]) \wedge (x \neq i \Rightarrow \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}})\}$.
Thus $((\exists R.C)[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} =$
$((o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)])) \sqcap$
$(\neg o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R + (i,j)])))^{\mathcal{I}}$

31. One can see that $(\exists S^-.C)[S := S + (i,j)]$ is similar to
$(\exists S^-.C)[S^- := S^- + (j,i)]$, that is replacing S by S^- and swapping i and j in the previous case.

32. As $(\exists R.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$,
$((\exists R.C)[R := R - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \exists y.(x,y) \in R[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge$
$y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ that is $((\exists R.C)[R := R - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} =$
$\{x \mid \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{\{(i,j)\}} \wedge y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\} =$
$\{x \mid \exists y.(x \neq i \vee y \neq j) \wedge ((x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}})\} = \{x \mid (x =$
$i \Rightarrow \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \neq j) \wedge$
$(x \neq i \Rightarrow \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}})\}$. Moreover,
$((o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R - (i,j)] \sqcup \neg o_j)) \sqcap (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R - (i,j)])))^{\mathcal{I}} =$
$\{x \mid (x = i \Rightarrow \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \neq j) \wedge$
$(x \neq i \Rightarrow \exists y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}})\}$. Thus
$((\exists R.C)[R := R - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} =$
$((o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R - (i,j)] \sqcup \neg o_j)) \sqcap (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R - (i,j)])))^{\mathcal{I}}$

33. One can see that $(\exists S^-.C)[S := S - (i,j)]$ is similar to
$(\exists S^-.C)[S^- := S^- - (j,i)]$, that is replacing S by S^- and swapping i and j in the previous case.

34. As $(\forall R.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, $((\forall R.C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[c := c \pm i]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ as $R^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of c. Thus, $((\forall R.C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\forall R.(C[c := c \pm i]))^{\mathcal{I}}$
35. As $(\forall R^-.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(y,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, $((\forall R^-.C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(y,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[c := c \pm i]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ as $R^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of c. Thus, $((\forall R^-.C)[c := c \pm i])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\forall R^-.(C[c := c \pm i]))^{\mathcal{I}}$
36. As $(\forall R.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, $((\forall R.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ as $R^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of R'. Thus,$((\forall R.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\forall R.(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]))^{\mathcal{I}}$
37. As $(\forall R^-.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(y,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, $((\forall R^-.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(y,x) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ as $R^{\mathcal{I}}$ is independent of the valuation of R'. Thus,$((\forall R^-.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = (\forall R^-.(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]))^{\mathcal{I}}$
38. As $(\forall R.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, $((\forall R.C)[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(i,j)\} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$. That is $((\forall R.C)[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid (\forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}) \wedge (x = i \Rightarrow j \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}})\} = \{x \mid (x = i \Rightarrow (\forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge j \in (C[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}})) \wedge (x \neq i \Rightarrow \forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}})\}$. Moreover, $((o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcap \exists R.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)])) \sqcap (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]))^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid (x = i \Rightarrow (\forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge j \in (C[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}})) \wedge (x \neq i \Rightarrow \forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R + (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}})\}$. Thus, $((\forall R.C)[R := R + (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = ((o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcap \exists R.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)])) \sqcap (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]))^{\mathcal{I}}$
39. One can see that $(\forall S^-.C)[S := S + (i,j)]$ is similar to $(\forall S^-.C)[S^- := S^- + (j,i)]$, that is replacing S by S^- and swapping i and j in the previous case.
40. As $(\forall R.C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, $((\forall R.C)[R := R - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \overline{\{(i,j)\}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}}\}$. That is $((\forall R.C)[R := R - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid (x \neq i \wedge \forall y.((x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}})) \vee (x = i \wedge \forall y.((x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \vee y = j))\} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x \neq i \wedge (x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}})\} \cap \{x \mid \forall y.(x = i \wedge (x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \vee y = j)\}$. Moreover, $(o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(o_j \sqcup C[R := R - (i,j)]))^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x = i \wedge (x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}} \vee y = j)\}$ and $(\neg o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R - (i,j)]))^{\mathcal{I}} = \{x \mid \forall y.(x \neq i \wedge (x,y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \Rightarrow y \in C[R := R - (i,j)]^{\mathcal{I}})\}$. Thus, $((\forall R.C)[R := R - (i,j)])^{\mathcal{I}} = ((o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R - (i,j)] \sqcup o_j)) \sqcap (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R - (i,j)])))^{\mathcal{I}}$
41. One can see that $(\forall S^-.C)[S := S - (i,j)]$ is similar to $(\forall S^-.C)[S^- := S^- - (j,i)]$, that is replacing S by S^- and swapping i and j in the previous case.

□

Next we prove the Lemma 2.

Let Σ be a signature, $\mathcal{T}$ is terminating.

Proof. To prove the termination, we introduce a pre-ordering $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}')$ defined as:

- $\mathcal{M}(\bot) = 0$
- $\mathcal{M}(c) = 0$
- $\mathcal{M}(\neg\ C) = \mathcal{M}(C)$
- $\mathcal{M}(C\ \sqcap\ D) = max(\mathcal{M}(C), \mathcal{M}(D))$
- $\mathcal{M}(C\ \sqcup\ D) = max(\mathcal{M}(C), \mathcal{M}(D))$
- $\mathcal{M}((\geq n\ S\ C)) = \mathcal{M}((\geq n\ S^-\ C)) = \mathcal{M}(C) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}((< n\ S\ C)) = \mathcal{M}((< n\ S^-\ C)) = \mathcal{M}(C) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}(\exists R.C) = \mathcal{M}(\exists R^-.C) = \mathcal{M}(C) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}(\forall R.C) = \mathcal{M}(\forall R^-.C) = \mathcal{M}(C) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}(o) = 0$
- $\mathcal{M}(\exists R.Self) = \mathcal{M}(\exists R^-.Self) = 0$
- $\mathcal{M}(C\theta) = \mathcal{M}(C) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}'(\bot) = 0$
- $\mathcal{M}'(c) = 0$
- $\mathcal{M}'((\neg\ C)) = \mathcal{M}'(C)$
- $\mathcal{M}'(C\ \sqcap\ D) = max(\mathcal{M}'(C), \mathcal{M}'(D))$
- $\mathcal{M}'(C\ \sqcup\ D) = max(\mathcal{M}'(C), \mathcal{M}'(D))$
- $\mathcal{M}'((\geq n\ S\ C)) = \mathcal{M}'((\geq n\ S^-\ C)) = \mathcal{M}'(C)$
- $\mathcal{M}'((< n\ S\ C)) = \mathcal{M}'((< n\ S^-\ C)) = \mathcal{M}'(C)$
- $\mathcal{M}'((\exists R.C)) = \mathcal{M}'((\exists R^-.C)) = \mathcal{M}'(C)$
- $\mathcal{M}'((\forall R.C)) = \mathcal{M}'((\forall R^-.C)) = \mathcal{M}'(C)$
- $\mathcal{M}'(o) = 0$
- $\mathcal{M}'(\exists R.Self) = \mathcal{M}'(\exists R^-.Self) = 0$
- $\mathcal{M}'(\bot\theta) = 0$
- $\mathcal{M}'(c\theta) = 0$
- $\mathcal{M}'((\neg\ C)\theta) = \mathcal{M}'(C\theta) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}'((C\ \sqcap\ D)\theta) = max(\mathcal{M}'(C\theta), \mathcal{M}'(D\theta)) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}'((C\ \sqcup\ D)\theta) = max(\mathcal{M}'(C\theta), \mathcal{M}'(D\theta)) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}'((\geq n\ S\ C)\theta) = \mathcal{M}'((\geq n\ S^-\ C)\theta) = \mathcal{M}'(C\theta) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}'((< n\ S\ C)\theta) = \mathcal{M}'((< n\ S^-\ C)\theta) = \mathcal{M}'(C\theta) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}'((\exists R.C)\theta) = \mathcal{M}'((\exists^- R.C)\theta) = \mathcal{M}'(C\theta) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}'((\forall R.C)\theta) = \mathcal{M}'((\forall R^-.C)\theta) = \mathcal{M}'(C\theta) + 1$
- $\mathcal{M}'(o\theta) = 0$
- $\mathcal{M}'((\exists R.Self)\theta) = \mathcal{M}'((\exists R^-.Self)\theta) = 0$

For every concept C, $\mathcal{M}(C)$ and $\mathcal{M}'(C)$ are positive. We now prove that the transformations either strictly decrease $\mathcal{M}$ or keep $\mathcal{M}$ constant and strictly decrease $\mathcal{M}'$. We compute the results of the functions for the left- and the right-hand side for each transformation.

1.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(\bot\ \theta) &= \mathcal{M}(\bot) + 1 = 1\\ \mathcal{M}(\bot) &= 0\end{aligned}$$
2.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(o\ \theta) &= \mathcal{M}(o) + 1 = 1\\ \mathcal{M}(o) &= 0\end{aligned}$$
3.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(c[R := R \pm (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}(c) + 1 = 1\\ \mathcal{M}(c) &= 0\end{aligned}$$
4.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(c[c' := c' \pm i]) &= \mathcal{M}(c) + 1 = 1\\ \mathcal{M}(c) &= 0\end{aligned}$$
5.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(c[c := c + i]) &= \mathcal{M}(c) + 1 = 1\\ \mathcal{M}(c \sqcup o_i) &= max(\mathcal{M}(c), \mathcal{M}(o_i)) = 0\end{aligned}$$
6.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(c[c := c - i]) &= \mathcal{M}(c) + 1 = 1\\ \mathcal{M}(c \sqcap \neg o_i) &= max(\mathcal{M}(c), \mathcal{M}(\neg o_i)) = 0\end{aligned}$$
7.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}((\neg C)\ \theta) &= \mathcal{M}(\neg C) + 1 = \mathcal{M}(C) + 1\\ \mathcal{M}(\neg(C\ \theta)) &= \mathcal{M}(C\ \theta) = \mathcal{M}(C) + 1\\ \mathcal{M}'((\neg C)\ \theta) &= \mathcal{M}'(C\theta) + 1\\ \mathcal{M}'(\neg(C\theta)) &= \mathcal{M}'(C\theta)\end{aligned}$$
8.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}((C \sqcup D)\ \theta) &= max(\mathcal{M}(C), \mathcal{M}(D)) + 1\\ \mathcal{M}(C\theta \sqcup D\theta) &= max(\mathcal{M}(C) + 1, \mathcal{M}(D) + 1)\\ \mathcal{M}'((C \sqcup D)\ \theta) &= max(\mathcal{M}'(C\theta), \mathcal{M}'(D\theta)) + 1\\ \mathcal{M}'(C\theta \sqcup D\theta) &= max(\mathcal{M}'(C\theta), \mathcal{M}'(D\theta))\end{aligned}$$
9.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}((C \sqcap D)\ \theta) &= max(\mathcal{M}(C), \mathcal{M}(D)) + 1\\ \mathcal{M}(C\theta \sqcap D\theta) &= max(\mathcal{M}(C) + 1, \mathcal{M}(D) + 1)\\ \mathcal{M}'((C \sqcap D)\ \theta) &= max(\mathcal{M}'(C\theta), \mathcal{M}'(D\theta)) + 1\\ \mathcal{M}'(C\theta \sqcap D\theta) &= max(\mathcal{M}'(C\theta), \mathcal{M}'(D\theta))\end{aligned}$$
10.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(\exists R.Self[c := c \pm i]) &= \mathcal{M}(\exists R.Self) + 1 = 1\\ \mathcal{M}(\exists R.Self) &= 0\end{aligned}$$
11. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.
12.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(\exists R.Self[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}(\exists R.Self) + 1 = 1\\ \mathcal{M}(\exists R.Self) &= 0\end{aligned}$$
13. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.
14.
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(\exists R.Self[R := R + (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}(\exists R.Self) + 1 = 1\\ \mathcal{M}((o_i \sqcap o_j) \sqcup \exists R.Self) &= 0\end{aligned}$$
15. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

16.
$$\mathcal{M}(\exists R.Self[R := R - (i,j)]) = \mathcal{M}(\exists R.Self) + 1 = 1$$
$$\mathcal{M}((\neg o_i \sqcup \neg o_j) \sqcap \exists R.Self) = 0$$

17. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

18.
$$\mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[c := c \pm i]) = \mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)) + 1 = \mathcal{M}(C) + 2$$
$$\mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[c := c \pm i])) = \mathcal{M}(C[c := c \pm i]) + 1 = \mathcal{M}(C) + 2$$
$$\mathcal{M}'((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[c := c \pm i]) = \mathcal{M}'(C[c := c \pm i]) + 1$$
$$\mathcal{M}'((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[c := c \pm i])) = \mathcal{M}'(C[c := c \pm i])$$

19. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

20.
$$\mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) = \mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)) + 1 = \mathcal{M}(C) + 2$$
$$\mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) = \mathcal{M}(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) + 1 = \mathcal{M}(C) + 2$$
$$\mathcal{M}'((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) = \mathcal{M}'(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) + 1$$
$$\mathcal{M}'((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])) = \mathcal{M}'(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])$$

21. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

22.
$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[S := S + (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(c_{1,16}) &= max(\mathcal{M}(o_j), \mathcal{M}(C[S := S + (i,j)])) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}(c_{2,16}) &= max(\mathcal{M}(\neg o_j), \mathcal{M}(\neg(C[S := S + (i,j)]))) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}(b_{1,16}) &= \mathcal{M}(o_i) \\
&= 0 \\
\mathcal{M}(b_{2,16}) &= \mathcal{M}(\exists U.c_{1,16}) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(c_{1,16}) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}(b_{3,16}) &= \mathcal{M}(\forall S.\neg o_j) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(\neg o_J) + 1 \\
&= 1 \\
\mathcal{M}(b_{4,16}) &= \mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ (n-1)\ S\ C[S := S + (i,j)])) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C[S := S + (i,j)]) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(b_{11,16}) &= \mathcal{M}(\neg o_i) \\
&= 0 \\
\mathcal{M}(b_{12,16}) &= \mathcal{M}(\forall U.c_{2,16}) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(c_{2,16}) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(b_{13,16}) &= \mathcal{M}(\exists S.o_j) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(o_J) + 1 \\
&= 1
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
\mathcal{M}(b_{14,16}) & = & \mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[S := S + (i,j)])) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}(C[S := S + (i,j)]) + 1 \\
& = & \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(a_{1,16}) & = & max(\mathcal{M}(b_{1,16}), \mathcal{M}(b_{2,16}), \mathcal{M}(b_{3,16}), \mathcal{M}(b_{4,16}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(a_{2,16}) & = & max(\mathcal{M}(b_{11,16}), \mathcal{M}(b_{12,16}), \mathcal{M}(b_{13,16}), \mathcal{M}(b_{14,16}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(RHS_{16}) & = & max(\mathcal{M}(a_{1,16}), \mathcal{M}(a_{2,16})) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}'((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[S := S + (i,j)]) & = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S + (i,j)]) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}'(c_{1,16}) & = & max(\mathcal{M}'(o_j), \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S + (i,j)])) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S + (i,j)]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(c_{2,16}) & = & max(\mathcal{M}'(\neg o_j), \mathcal{M}'(\neg(C[S := S + (i,j)]))) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S + (i,j)]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{1,16}) & = & \mathcal{M}(o_i) \\
& = & 0 \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{2,16}) & = & \mathcal{M}(\exists U.c_{1,16}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(c_{1,16}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S + (i,j)]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{3,16}) & = & \mathcal{M}(\forall S.\neg o_j) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(\neg o_J) \\
& = & 0 \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{4,16}) & = & \mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ (n-1)\ S\ C[S := S + (i,j)]) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S + (i,j)]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{11,16}) & = & \mathcal{M}'(\neg o_i) \\
& = & 0 \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{12,16}) & = & \mathcal{M}'(\forall U.c_{2,16}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(c_{2,16}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}(C[S := S + (i,j]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{13,16}) & = & \mathcal{M}'(\exists S.o_j) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(o_J) \\
& = & 0 \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{14,16}) & = & \mathcal{M}'((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[S := S + (i,j)])) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S + (i,j)]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(a_{1,16}) & = & max(\mathcal{M}'(b_{1,16}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{2,16}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{3,16}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{4,16}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S + (i,j)]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(a_{2,16}) & = & max(\mathcal{M}'(b_{11,16}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{12,16}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{13,16}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{14,16}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S + (i,j)]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(RHS_{16}) & = & max(\mathcal{M}'(a_{1,16}), \mathcal{M}'(a_{2,16})) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}(C[S := S + (i,j)])
\end{array}
$$

23. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

24.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[S := S-(i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)+1\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C)+2\\
\mathcal{M}(c_{1,17}) &= max(\mathcal{M}(o_j), \mathcal{M}(C[S := S-(i,j)]))\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C)+1\\
\mathcal{M}(c_{2,17}) &= max(\mathcal{M}(\neg o_j), \mathcal{M}(\neg(C[S := S-(i,j)])))\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C)+1\\
\mathcal{M}(b_{1,17}) &= \mathcal{M}(o_i)\\
&= 0\\
\mathcal{M}(b_{2,17}) &= \mathcal{M}(\exists U.c_{1,17})\\
&= \mathcal{M}(c_{1,17})+1\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C)+2\\
\mathcal{M}(b_{3,17}) &= \mathcal{M}(\exists S.o_j)\\
&= \mathcal{M}(\neg o_J)+1\\
&= 1\\
\mathcal{M}(b_{4,17}) &= \mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ (n+1)\ S\ C[S := S-(i,j)]))\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C[S := S-(i,j)])+1\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C)+2\\
\mathcal{M}(b_{11,17}) &= \mathcal{M}(\neg o_i)\\
&= 0\\
\mathcal{M}(b_{12,17}) &= \mathcal{M}(\forall U.c_{2,17})\\
&= \mathcal{M}(c_{2,17})+1\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C)+2\\
\mathcal{M}(b_{13,17}) &= \mathcal{M}(\forall S.\neg o_j)\\
&= \mathcal{M}(o_J)+1\\
&= 1\\
\mathcal{M}(b_{14,17}) &= \mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[S := S+(i,j)]))\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C[S := S-(i,j)])+1\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C)+2\\
\mathcal{M}(a_{1,17}) &= max(\mathcal{M}(b_{1,17}), \mathcal{M}(b_{2,17}), \mathcal{M}(b_{3,17}), \mathcal{M}(b_{4,17})\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C)+2\\
\mathcal{M}(a_{2,17}) &= max(\mathcal{M}(b_{11,17}), \mathcal{M}(b_{12,17}), \mathcal{M}(b_{13,17}), \mathcal{M}(b_{14,17})\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C)+2\\
\mathcal{M}(RHS_{17}) &= max(\mathcal{M}(a_{1,17}), \mathcal{M}(a_{2,17}))\\
&= \mathcal{M}(C)+2\\
\mathcal{M}'((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C)[S := S-(i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S-(i,j)])+1\\
\mathcal{M}'(c_{1,17}) &= max(\mathcal{M}'(o_j), \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S-(i,j)]))\\
&= \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S-(i,j)])\\
\mathcal{M}'(c_{2,17}) &= max(\mathcal{M}'(\neg o_j), \mathcal{M}'(\neg(C[S := S-(i,j)])))\\
&= \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S-(i,j)])\\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{1,17}) &= \mathcal{M}(o_i)\\
&= 0\\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{2,17}) &= \mathcal{M}(\exists U.c_{1,17})\\
&= \mathcal{M}'(c_{1,17})\\
&= \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S-(i,j)])
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
\mathcal{M}'(b_{3,17}) & = & \mathcal{M}(\forall S.\neg o_j) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(\neg o_J) \\
& = & 0 \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{4,17}) & = & \mathcal{M}((\bowtie\ (n+1)\ S\ C[S := S-(i,j)]) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S-(i,j)]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{11,17}) & = & \mathcal{M}'(\neg o_i) \\
& = & 0 \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{12,17}) & = & \mathcal{M}'(\forall U.c_{2,17}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(c_{2,17}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}(C[S := S-(i,j]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{13,17}) & = & \mathcal{M}'(\forall S.\neg o_j) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(o_J) \\
& = & 0 \\
\mathcal{M}'(b_{14,17}) & = & \mathcal{M}'((\bowtie\ n\ S\ C[S := S-(i,j)])) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S-(i,j)]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(a_{1,17}) & = & max(\mathcal{M}'(b_{1,17}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{2,17}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{3,17}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{4,17}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S-(i,j)]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(a_{2,17}) & = & max(\mathcal{M}'(b_{11,17}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{12,17}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{13,17}), \mathcal{M}'(b_{14,17}) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}'(C[S := S-(i,j)]) \\
\mathcal{M}'(RHS_{17}) & = & max(\mathcal{M}'(a_{1,17}), \mathcal{M}'(a_{2,17})) \\
& = & \mathcal{M}(C[S := S-(i,j)])
\end{array}
$$

25. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

26.
$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
\mathcal{M}((\exists R.C)[c := c \pm i]) & = & \mathcal{M}(\exists R.C) + 1 & = & \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(\exists R.(C[c := c \pm i])) & = & \mathcal{M}(C[c := c \pm i]) + 1 & = & \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}'((\exists R.C)[c := c \pm i]) & & & = & \mathcal{M}'(C[c := c \pm i]) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}'(\exists R.(C[c := c \pm i])) & & & = & \mathcal{M}(C[c := c \pm i])
\end{array}
$$

27. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

28.
$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
\mathcal{M}((\exists R.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) & = & \mathcal{M}(\exists R.C) + 1 & = & \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(\exists R.(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])) & = & \mathcal{M}(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) + 1 & = & \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}'((\exists R.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) & & & = & \mathcal{M}'(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}'(\exists R.(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])) & & & = & \mathcal{M}(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])
\end{array}
$$

29. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

30.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}((\exists R.C)[R := R + (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}(\exists R.C) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(d_1) &= max(\mathcal{M}(\neg o_i), \mathcal{M}(d_{1,1}), \mathcal{M}(d_{1,2}), \mathcal{M}(o_i), \mathcal{M}(d_{1,3})) \\
&= max(\mathcal{M}(o_i), \mathcal{M}(d_{1,1,1}) + 2, max(\mathcal{M}(o_j), \mathcal{M}(d_{1,2,1})) + 1, \\
&\quad 0, \mathcal{M}(d_{1,3,1}) + 1) \\
&= max(0, \mathcal{M}(C) + 2, max(0, \mathcal{M}(C) + 1) + 1, \mathcal{M}(C) + 2) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}'((\exists R.C)[R := R + (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R + (i,j)]) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}'(d_1) &= max(\mathcal{M}'(\neg o_i), \mathcal{M}'(d_{1,1}), \mathcal{M}'(d_{1,2}), \mathcal{M}'(o_i), \mathcal{M}'(d_{1,3})) \\
&= max(\mathcal{M}'(o_i), \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R + (i,j)]), \\
&\quad max(\mathcal{M}'(o_j), \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R + (i,j)])), 0, \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R + (i,j)])) \\
&= \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R + (i,j)])
\end{aligned}$$

31. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

32.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}((\exists R.C)[R := R - (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}(\exists R.C) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(d_2) &= max(\mathcal{M}(\neg o_i), \mathcal{M}(d_{2,1}), \mathcal{M}(o_i), \mathcal{M}(d_{2,2})) \\
&= max(\mathcal{M}(o_i), max(\mathcal{M}(d_{2,1,1}), \mathcal{M}(\neg o_j)) + 1, 0, \mathcal{M}(d_{2,2,1}) + 1) \\
&= max(0, max(\mathcal{M}(C) + 1, \mathcal{M}(o_i)) + 1, \mathcal{M}(C) + 2) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}'((\exists R.C)[R := R - (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R - (i,j)]) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}'(d_2) &= max(\mathcal{M}'(\neg o_i), \mathcal{M}'(d_{2,1}), \mathcal{M}'(o_i), \mathcal{M}'(d_{2,2})) \\
&= max(\mathcal{M}'(o_i), max(\mathcal{M}'(C[R := R - (i,j)]), \mathcal{M}'(\neg o_j)), \\
&\quad 0, \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R - (i,j)])) \\
&= max(0, max(\mathcal{M}'(C[R := R - (i,j)]), \mathcal{M}'(o_j)), \\
&\quad \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R - (i,j)])) \\
&= \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R - (i,j)])
\end{aligned}$$

33. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

34.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}((\forall R.C)[c := c \pm i]) &= \mathcal{M}(\forall R.C) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(\forall R.(C[c := c \pm i])) &= \mathcal{M}(C[c := c \pm i]) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}'((\forall R.C)[c := c \pm i]) &= \mathcal{M}'(C[c := c \pm i]) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}'(\forall R.(C[c := c \pm i])) &= \mathcal{M}'(C[c := c \pm i])
\end{aligned}$$

35. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

36.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}((\forall R.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]]) &= \mathcal{M}(\forall R.C) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(\forall R.(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])) &= \mathcal{M}(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}'((\forall R.C)[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}'(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)]) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}'(\forall R.(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])) &= \mathcal{M}'(C[R' := R' \pm (i,j)])
\end{aligned}$$

37. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

38.
$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}((\forall R.C)[R := R + (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}(\forall R.C) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(d_3) &= max(\mathcal{M}(\neg o_i), \mathcal{M}(d_{3,1}), \mathcal{M}(d_{3,2}), \mathcal{M}(o_i), \mathcal{M}(d_{3,3})) \\
&= max(\mathcal{M}(o_i), \mathcal{M}(d_{3,1,1}), max(\mathcal{M}(o_j), \mathcal{M}(d_{3,2,1})) + 1, \\
&\quad 0, \mathcal{M}(d_{3,3,1}) + 1) \\
&= max(0, \mathcal{M}(C) + 2, \mathcal{M}(C) + 2) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}'((\forall R.C)[R := R + (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}(\forall R.C[R := R + (i,j)]) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}'(d_3) &= max(\mathcal{M}'(\neg o_i), \mathcal{M}'(d_{3,1}), \mathcal{M}'(d_{3,2}), \mathcal{M}'(o_i), \mathcal{M}'(d_{3,3})) \\
&= max(\mathcal{M}'(o_i), \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R + (i,j)]), \\
&\quad max(\mathcal{M}'(o_j), \mathcal{M}(C[R := R + (i,j)])), 0, \mathcal{M}(C[R := R + (i,j)])) \\
&= max(0, \mathcal{M}(C[R := R + (i,j)]), \mathcal{M}(C[R := R + (i,j)])) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C)
\end{aligned}$$

39. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

40.
$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}((\forall R.C)[R := R - (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}(\forall R.C) + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}(d_4) &= max(\mathcal{M}(\neg o_i), \mathcal{M}(d_{4,1}), \mathcal{M}(o_i), \mathcal{M}(d_{4,2})) \\
&= max(\mathcal{M}(o_i), max(\mathcal{M}(d_{4,1,1}), \mathcal{M}(o_j)) + 1, 0, \mathcal{M}(d_{4,2,1}) + 1) \\
&= max(0, max(\mathcal{M}(C) + 1, 0) + 1, \mathcal{M}(C) + 2) \\
&= \mathcal{M}(C) + 2 \\
\mathcal{M}'((\forall R.C)[R := R - (i,j)]) &= \mathcal{M}(C[R := R - (i,j)]) + 1 \\
\mathcal{M}'(d_4) &= max(\mathcal{M}'(\neg o_i), \mathcal{M}'(d_{4,1}), \mathcal{M}'(o_i), \mathcal{M}'(d_{4,2})) \\
&= max(\mathcal{M}'(o_i), max(\mathcal{M}'(C[R := R - (i,j)]), \mathcal{M}'(o_j)), \\
&\quad 0, \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R - (i,j)])) \\
&= max(0, max(\mathcal{M}'(C[R := R - (i,j)]), 0), \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R - (i,j)])) \\
&= \mathcal{M}'(C[R := R - (i,j)])
\end{aligned}$$

41. As the definitions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ do not discriminate R and R^-, this rule is identic to the previous one.

where :

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
RHS_{16} = & ((o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcap \forall R.\neg o_j) & \Rightarrow (\bowtie\ (n-1)\ R\ C[R := R + (i,j)])) \\
\sqcap & ((\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists R.o_j) & \Rightarrow\ \ (\bowtie\ n\ R\ C[R := R + (i,j)])) \\
RHS_{17} = & ((o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R - (i,j)]) \sqcap \exists R.o_j) & \Rightarrow (\bowtie\ (n+1)\ R\ C[R := R - (i,j)])) \\
\sqcap & ((\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg C[R := R - (i,j)]) \sqcup \forall R.\neg o_j) & \Rightarrow\ \ (\bowtie\ n\ R\ C[R := R - (i,j)])) \\
a_{1,16} = & (o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcap \forall R.\neg o_j) & \Rightarrow (\bowtie\ (n-1)\ R\ C[R := R + (i,j)]) \\
a_{2,16} = & (\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists R.o_j) & \Rightarrow\ \ (\bowtie\ n\ R\ C[R := R + (i,j)]) \\
a_{1,17} = & (o_i \sqcap \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R - (i,j)]) \sqcap \exists R.o_j) & \Rightarrow (\bowtie\ (n+1)\ R\ C[R := R - (i,j)]) \\
a_{2,17} = & (\neg o_i \sqcup \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg C[R := R - (i,j)]) \sqcup \forall R.\neg o_j) & \Rightarrow\ \ (\bowtie\ n\ R\ C[R := R - (i,j)]) \\
b_{1,16} = & o_i & \\
b_{2,16} = & \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)]) & \\
b_{3,16} = & \forall R.\neg o_j & \\
b_{4,16} = & (\bowtie\ (n-1)\ R\ C[R := R + (i,j)])) & \\
b_{11,16} = & \neg o_i & \\
b_{12,16} = & \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg(C[R := R + (i,j)])) & \\
b_{13,16} = & \exists R.o_j & \\
b_{14,16} = & (\bowtie\ n\ R\ C[R := R + (i,j)])) & \\
b_{1,17} = & o_i & \\
b_{2,17} = & \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R - (i,j)]) & \\
b_{3,17} = & \exists R.o_j & \\
b_{4,17} = & (\bowtie\ (n+1)\ R\ C[R := R - (i,j)])) & \\
b_{11,17} = & \neg o_i & \\
b_{12,17} = & \forall U.(\neg o_j \sqcup \neg(C[R := R - (i,j)])) & \\
b_{13,17} = & \forall R.\neg o_j & \\
b_{14,17} = & (\bowtie\ n\ R\ C[R := R - (i,j)])) & \\
c_{1,16} = & (o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)]) & \\
c_{2,16} = & (\neg o_j \sqcup \neg(C[R := R + (i,j)])) & \\
c_{1,17} = & (o_j \sqcap C[R := R - (i,j)]) & \\
c_{2,17} = & (\neg o_j \sqcup \neg(C[R := R - (i,j)])) &
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
d_1 & = (o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)])) \sqcap (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R + (i,j)])) \\
 & = (\neg o_i \sqcup \exists R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcup \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)])) \sqcap (o_i \sqcup \exists R.(C[R := R + (i,j)])) \\
d_{1,1} & = \exists R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \\
d_{1,2} & = \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)]) \\
d_{1,3} & = \exists R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \\
d_{1,2,1} & = o_j \\
d_{1,2,2} & = C[R := R + (i,j)] \\
d_{1,3,1} & = C[R := R + (i,j)] \\
d_2 & = (o_i \Rightarrow (\exists R.(C[R := R - (i,j)] \sqcap \neg o_j))) \sqcap (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \exists R.(C[R := R - (i,j)])) \\
 & = (\neg o_i \sqcup (\exists R.(C[R := R - (i,j)] \sqcap \neg o_j))) \sqcap (o_i \sqcup \exists R.(C[R := R - (i,j)])) \\
d_{2,1} & = \exists R.(C[R := R - (i,j)] \sqcap \neg o_j) \\
d_{2,2} & = \exists R.(C[R := R - (i,j)]) \\
d_{2,1,1} & = C[R := R - (i,j)] \\
d_{2,1,2} & = \neg o_j \\
d_{2,2,1} & = C[R := R - (i,j)]
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
d_3 &= (o_i \Rightarrow (\forall R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcap \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)]))) \sqcap (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R + (i,j)])) \\
&= (\neg o_i \sqcup (\forall R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \sqcap \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)]))) \sqcap (o_i \sqcup \forall R.(C[R := R + (i,j)])) \\
d_{3,1} &= \forall R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \\
d_{3,2} &= \exists U.(o_j \sqcap C[R := R + (i,j)]) \\
d_{3,3} &= \forall R.(C[R := R + (i,j)]) \\
d_{3,2,1} &= C[R := R + (i,j)] \\
d_{3,3,1} &= C[R := R + (i,j)] \\
d_4 &= (o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R - (i,j)] \sqcup o_j)) \sqcap (\neg o_i \Rightarrow \forall R.(C[R := R - (i,j)])) \\
&= (\neg o_i \sqcup \forall R.(C[R := R - (i,j)] \sqcup o_j)) \sqcap (o_i \sqcup \forall R.(C[R := R - (i,j)])) \\
d_{4,1} &= \forall R.(C[R := R - (i,j)] \sqcup o_j) \\
d_{4,2} &= \forall R.(C[R := R - (i,j)]) \\
d_{4,1,1} &= C[R := R - (i,j)] \\
d_{4,2,1} &= C[R := R - (i,j)]
\end{aligned}
$$

□